

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成25年度
(第17号)

**Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University**

for the Academic Year 2013

Volume XVII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2014・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2014

Reviewing Rgs XIV 2 & 7
How One Can Rescue Oneself When Shipwrecked in the Ocean
With Some Reference to Haribhadra's Commentary

海難から自らを救う術
寶德藏般若譬喩品の原点理解再検

Akira YUYAMA / 湯山明

To the Memory of Tilmann Ernst Vetter (1937-2012)

Foreword with a fond memory of Tilmann: — For some time I have been thinking of dedicating a paper to Dr. Tilmann Ernst Vetter (Pforzheim, Baden-Württemberg, 2 March 1937 – Wassenaar, Zuidholland, 20 December 2012), Professor Emeritus of Indian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies at the University of Leiden.¹ While I was rather slow at work, I received all of a sudden the terribly sad news that Tilmann had passed away. Professor Lambert Schmithausen of Hamburg informed me of it. Lambert said that he had spoken with him in very good spirits on the phone just a day before his death. I felt so guilty that I could not finish this paper in time. Alas! He was younger than I.

As it is well known, Tilmann, Lambert (*Cologne, 1939) and Ernst Steinkellner (*Graz, 3 October 1937) were the so-called triumvirate friends of outstanding young brain working together with their teacher Professor Erich Frauwallner (1898-1974) in Vienna around the early 1960s. Although he was working in the field far out of my line, he became well known to us through his publications from Vienna as early as in 1964.²

After the gymnasium in his hometown Pforzheim (Germany), Tilmann studied Indology in Tübingen with Professor Helmuth von Glasenapp (1891-1963) among others. Incidentally, Tilmann studied also in Hamburg sometime in 1956-1958 before moving to the Austrian floral capital of Vienna.

It was probably towards the end of the 1970s that I visited Tilmann in Leiden, where I

¹ Hoogleraar voor de vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuid- en Central-Azië aan de Universiteit Leiden / Instituut Kern (Indologisch Instituut).

² See e.g. *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti* (= *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse*, Band CCXLV, 2. Abhandlung) (= *Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens*, Heft 1) (Wien: Hermann Böhlau – Nachfolger: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1964), 118 p.

had studied under the guidance of Professors J. W. de Jong (1921-2000) and F. B. J. Kuiper (1907-2003) at the Kern (Indological) Institute for two academic years 1963-1965. I had therefore known his celebrated name since he was in Utrecht around 1960s.

Even now I recall a very fond memory with Tilmann, who, during my visit there at that time, invited me to his place at Wassenaar, a prestigious residential district situated between Leiden and The Hague. Tilmann took me to a walk along the handsome dunes. He then energetically began to discuss philosophical questions in German. I told him that the topic was too a high level to me. He then said to me – “You speak to me in English, and I speak in German to you”. Alas! It was not the question of the language, but simply of my poor knowledge — yes, just ignorance!

Just by the way, Professor Michael Witzel of Harvard, had lived only one but two houses next to Vetter’s on the same street in Wassenaar during his academic tenure of office in Leiden (1978-1986). I met Michael for the first time in Kathmandu in 1978 at the Centre for Nepal Studies, and when he was just moving to Leiden. Professor Oskar von Hinüber had just arrived to take his office in turn. At that time I learned a lot on the then state of affairs on manuscript preservation in Nepal.

Tilmann held the renowned Chair of Buddhist Studies at Leiden from 1974 until 2000.³

The founding chair holder, Professor J. W. de Jong, left there for Canberra in 1965. Then it was succeeded for a while from 1966 to 1972 by Professor David Seyffort Ruegg (*New York City, 1931) immediately before Tilmann. During his professorial tenure in Leiden he planted the productive root of his profound knowledge of the subjects to his pupils — I recall the names of Johannes Bronkhorst of Lausanne (promoted to the second doctorate in 1980), Peter Verhagen of Leiden (1991), Yūko Ijiri of Kyoto-Himeji (井尻裕子 / 2005) among many others.

I wonder if Ms. Ijiri’s doctoral dissertation has appeared in print,⁴ for I am much eager to see it. A reason for this is that she was in my class when I was there as Numata Professor of Buddhist Studies in autumn 1997. Her work on the very Mahāyāna-sūtra reminds me of her grandfather Susumu Ijiri’s pioneering impressive work on the Borobudur site in Central Java since the early 1920s.⁵ - A well-known art museum to his memory was established in 1989: Enzan Memorial Museum of Art & Crafts (圓山記念日本工芸美術館) with a beautiful Japanese garden in the City of Himeji, Hyōgo Prefecture. Regrettably, I have failed to visit the museum, though.

In the autumnal session 1997 I was obliged to offer a course both in the Institute Kern

³. His inaugural lecture: *Methodische consequentie bij twee Indische denkers: Dharmakīrti en Śaṅkara: Rede, uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van gewoon hoogleraar in de Boeddholgie, de Indische wijsbegeerte en het Tibetaans aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden op 7 November 1975* (Leiden: University Press, 1975).

⁴. Yūko Ijiri, *The Four Upāsaka Chapters of the Gaṇḍavyūha: A Comparative Edition and a Translation* (Diss., Leiden 2005).

⁵. 井尻進, ボロブドゥル・ジャワの佛教遺跡 (上海: 無憂園内・大乘社／青木文教, 1924), (i), (i), 2, 3, 2, 20, 269, 34 (索引) p., num. plates in the text. — Originally published in the monthly periodical *Daijō* (大乘), entitled “Studies on Borobudur (ボロブドゥル研究)” (from March 1923 to March 1924).

—, ジャバ霊跡・ボロブドゥル巡礼／方廣大莊嚴經物語 [地婆訶羅奉譯・方廣大莊嚴經亦名神通遊戲] (飾磨市阿成・位田庄八, 1941), 420 p., 120 ill. (after the photos by Krom) [Not for sale].

(Indological Institute) and in the Institute for Japanese and Korean Studies: I conducted an advanced seminar on the Rgs, Chapter XIV, and the then newly discovered mediaeval Japanese Buddhist narrative literature named *Chūkōsen* (注好選).⁶

To my intimate affairs, I am grateful to Tilmann, who has contributed an enlightening article with Professor Paul Maxwell Harrison (*Auckland, 1950), now of Stanford, on a difficult problem regarding the Chinese translation of An Shigao (安世高) to the festschrift presented to me in 1998.⁷ His profound knowledge of Buddhist Chinese has surprised me a great deal. Further, I cannot but mention his extremely meticulous work published just recently.⁸ He was literally a polyglot — needless to say, in addition to the European languages, he had mastered main languages of Asia, classical and modern, e.g. Indic, Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese, etc. His Dutch was naturally like his mother tongue!

In this connection I still regret very much that I could not attend a conference on An Shigao held in Leiden some ten years ago. Furthermore, I learned later that the discovery of rare Indic manuscripts in Afghanistan was made a good topic of conversation at table beside the central discussion on An Shigao. The then current topic has appeared in some important publications.⁹

To my surprise, Tilmann wanted to join the course for the Rgs. I was delighted to see him spare no efforts at offering productive suggestions and considering fruitful propositions of other possible understandings and interpretations. We could thus re-consider other possible readings of this extremely difficult text.

The following humble paper is thus dedicated to the fond memory of Tilmann, and of well-trained excellent students in the seminar class. They gave me a wonderful gift during my stay there. From among many others I have hereinafter picked up only a topic on the illustrative episode about those who are being shipwrecked and drowned in the ocean.

⁶ On returning home, I published the fruit of this seminar: 湯山明, “仏教説話文学研究覚書(1): 「注好選」下巻第十話『雙鴈は渴せる龜を將て去る』雑録”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 69-90; “ — (2): — 試訳”, *ibid.*, p. 91-95 [an annotated English translation]; “ — (3): — 余滴”, *ARIRIAB*, II: 1998 (1999), p. 90-92.

⁷ T. Vetter & P. Harrison, “An Shigao’s Chinese Translation of the Saptasthānasūtra”, *Sūryacandrāya* (1998), p. 197-216. — cf. *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 358.

⁸ Tilmann Vetter, *A Lexicographical Study of An Shigao’s and his Circle’s Chinese Translations of Buddhist Texts* (= *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Monograph Series*, XXVIII) (Tokyo: IIBS at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, 2012), 344 p. — ISBN 978-4-906267-66-8.

⁹ In the first place a series of collaborative work on the Schøyen Collection has surprised me a great deal: — *Buddhist Manuscripts*, I, ed. Jens Braarvig (= *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, I) (Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2000), xxii, 302 p., XII pl. — Reviewed by Daniel Boucher, *III*, XLV, 3 (2002), p. 245-259; 薩爾吉 (Saerji), 華林, III (2003), p. 441-444 (for Vols. I & II). — for the contents in details see A. Yuyama, *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000 (2001), p. 70; — , *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 353.

Cf. elsewhere e.g. *Manuscripts of the Silk Road* (= *Catalogue*, XXIX) (London: Sam Fogg, 2004), 52 p., incl. num. ills.: — *The exhibition was held 4-12 November 2004* (Text by Ramsey Fendall & Will Kwiatkowski — *Collaborators among others*: Kumamoto, Matsuda, Sander, Sims-Williams, Skjærvø, Hartmann, Wille).

Manuscripts from the Himalayas and the Indian Subcontinent (= *Catalogue*, XVII) (London: Sam Fogg, 1996), 161 p., 1 frontisp.; also other catalogues published by Sam Fogg in London!

Interesting work among others is e.g. Jens Braarvig & Frederik Liland with contributions by Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Richard Salomon, Lore Sander, *Traces for Gandhāran Buddhism: An Exhibition of Ancient Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection* (Oslo: Hermes Publishing in collaboration with Amarin Printing & Publishing Public, 2010), 136 p., photos, ills. — ISBN 978-82-8034-075-0.

Chapter XIV ‘Aupamyā-Parivarta’ of the Rgs, like AsP, is, as the title itself tells, devoted to the illustration of the story of the drowning ones as a result of a shipwreck in the midst of the ocean. In particular we meet a number of stories, in which five hundred traders wrecked in the sea, when carrying a plenty of treasures. The number ‘five hundred’ is furthermore rather symbolic in Indian literature (cf. e.g. Lienhard 1985, esp. p. 9-32, 101 & 107; Yuyama 1992, 2004a & 2004b). Cf. further e.g. a colophon itself telling us what has happened:—

samāptam śāriputra-maudgalyāyana-pramukhānām pañcānām bhikṣu-śātānām rākṣasī-dvīpa-kṣiptānām jātakam / (MvAv, éd. Senart, III.90.9-10).¹⁰

Although the number “500” in Indic literature is so interesting, I must omit it, except citing herewith a few works on the topic.¹¹ It may however be worth noting that Hiraoka refers this passage to the following texts (Hiraoka, II, p. 544):

na mahāsamudro mṛtakūṇapena sārđham saṃvasati, with reference to mahāsamuddo na matena kūṇapena saṃvasati (Vin. ii 237.28-29), and mahāsamudro mṛtakūṇapena sārđham rātriṃ na prativasati (Mv iii 354.7).

In this text we still see a number of problems. One of the problems to be solved urgently is the origin of the Turfan fragment. My previous view to regard it as a kind of Peking blockprint text may have to be corrected. I am at the moment collecting the materials to solve the very question, e.g. by means of its shape — say, an accordion-type book printed by blocks or any other means!

* * *

Tilmann Vetter's some more principal monographs among others

Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ*, 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam. Einleitung, Text der tibetischen Übersetzung, Sanskritfragmente, deutsche Übersetzung (= Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, CCL, Abhandlung 3) (= Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, III) (Wien: Hermann Böhlaus - Nachfolger, 1966), 111 p.

Maṇḍanamīśras *Brahmasiddhiḥ Brahmakāṇḍaḥ*: Übersetzung, Einleitung und Anmerkungen (= Sitzungsberichte ..., CCLXII, 2) (= Veröffentlichungen ..., VII) (Wien 1969), 126 p.

Sarvajñātman's *Samkṣepasārtakam*, 1. Kapitel: Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen (= Sitzungsberichte ..., CCLXXXII, 3) (= Veröffentlichungen ..., XI) (Wien 1972), 176 p.

Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śāṅkaras (= Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, VI) (Leiden: E. J. Brill / Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1979), 153 p. — ISBN 3-90027105-4.

Der Buddha und seine Lehre in Dharmakīrtis Pramāṇavārttika: Der Abschnitt über den Buddha und die vier edlen Wahrheiten im Pramāṇasiddhi-Kapitel (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, XII) (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1984), 183 p.

The 'khanda passages' in the Vinaya-piṭaka and the four main Nikāyas (= Sitzungsberichte ..., DCLXXXII) (= Veröffentlichungen ..., XXIII) (Wien 2000), 357 p. — ISBN 3-70012932-7.

¹⁰. Cf. trsl. Jones, III p. 93 — further Hiraoka 2010, II, p. 235; Yuyama 2001a, p. lxiv.

¹¹. Cf. e.g. Yuyama 1992 (see Yuyama 2012, p. 368: Item 56); — reference can be extended to Noboru Karashima's chain of work on 500 traders in the Indian Ocean, i.e. Karashima 2003 for an example out of many others.

Rgs XIV 2

A diplomatic reading of Rgs XIV 2 in the MS K:

(K13a5) सामुद्रियाययथनावि□□□□□लुग्भियायोमृतकम्मनुष्यतृणकाष्ठम

(K13a6) गृहमानो। विलयंप्रयातिजलमध्यअप्राप्ततीरो। योगृहतेव्रजतिपारस्थलंप्रयाति ॥

The portion □□□□□ is a drawstring casing space square of about 6-*akṣaras* with a hole in the centre. It occupies 4 lines, leaving the first and sixth lines no space. — For further details on the so-called Calcutta Manuscript (abbr. K) see Yuyama 1976, p. xxiii, as well as *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 353 fn.* Cf. also Yuyama 1976, frontispiece (facsimile and description)!

Rgs XIV.2 reconstructed:*sāmudriyāya yatha nāvi pralugnayāye**mṛtakam manuṣya tṛṇa-kāṣṭham a-grhṇamāno /**vilayaṇ prayāti jala-madhya a-prāpta-tīro**yo grhṇate vrajati pāra sthalaṇ prayāti // 2 //***Text-critical notes on Rgs XIV.2:**

The text reads *pāda* by *pāda* with a *danḍa* after another, and the *dvidanḍa* after the verse, i.e. the end of the fourth *pāda*. Ms K reads without making any space between the words as usual in Indic Mss. Each *pāda* reads as a rule 14 syllables of the metrical scheme *Vasantatilakā*, i.e. *ta-bha-ja-ja-ga-ga/la*: cf. for further details Yuyama 1973a. For more detailed critical apparatuses see Yuyama 1976, p. 54 (ad Rgs XIV.2). It is a great pity that this verse is missing in the Turfan fragment (cf. Yuyama 1986, 2007a, 2007b, 2008 & 2010).

Recension B, as published by Obermiller 1937, is nothing but the Chinese blockprint bilingual text: cf. Lokesh Chandra 1980, folio 43b4-44a1 for Rgs XIV.2 (Text in *Raṇjana* or *Lañ-tsha* script in the first line, transcribed and translated into Tibetan in *Dbu-can* script respectively).

Stories of ocean-going traders in danger (often 500 people on board) have been a favourite topic as attested in various genres of Indian literature: see e.g. among others Yuyama 1983, p. xi-xvi.

Since then I have touched upon this topic on various occasions, e.g. see Yuyama 2004a-2004b, 2005, 2011.

Otherwise this has been treated in varied narrative stories in various ways and for various motives — and in many cases 500 traders play the topical rôle, i.e. ‘*pañca vāṇija-śatāni*’, *MvAv* ed. Senart 1897/1977, III.67.8-90.10, trsl. Jones 1956/1983, III p. 70-93, Hiraoka 2010, III p. 219-235; for further details on the old manuscripts of the *MvAv* see Yuyama 2001a, p. lxiv cum n. 23. One of the most interesting art objects on the topic is to be found in a painted scroll from Nepal, which has been meticulously brought out from Berlin by Lienhard 1985.

Stories of 500 ocean-going traders have been not only in narrative literature, but also attested in particular through aquatic archaeological and historical finds: cf. esp. Noboru Karashima 1998-2001-2003-2004 among his many other writings.

The number 500 as a numeral in early Buddhist literature may well be worth noting for further investigation: cf. Yuyama 1992.

2a: *sāmudriya-*: cf. Tib. *rgya-mthor* ‘jug-pa, ‘ocean going’; *AsP mahā-samudra-gata-* : Tib. *rgya-mtso chen-por žugs-pa*; cf. also *Mvy* 5317 *sāmudrika-nāvaḥ* / *rgya-mtsho* ‘i *gru-bo-che* / 大航船.

nāvi, loc.sg.f., here forms apparently a locative absolute, as is also attested clearly in *AsP* 143.7, 9: *mahā-samudra-gatāyāṃ nāvi bhinnāyāṃ*, so Tib. *rgya-mtsho chen-por žugs-pa* ‘i *gru chag-pa-na* (ed. Peking MI 171b3, 4).

The reading *nāvi*, loc.sg.f., in our text is doubtlessly a Skt. form, while one finds elsewhere a BHS forms from the stem *nāvā-*: nom.sg.f. *nāvā*, *Rgs* I.7a, and *nāva*, I.7c. The word *nāvā-*, fem., “ship” (so Tib. *gru*), is to be connected with Middle Indic, as testified in Pali (cf. *PTSD*, II, p. 186b) and Pkt. (cf. Seth, p. 386), rather to connect with Vedic: cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner III, §122c, *Anm.* Wogihara rightly guesses a stem *nāvā-* for *Mvy* 6516: cf. Wogihara 1915, p. 45 ad *Mvy* 245.114. Cf. further Yuyama 1972, p. 32, and 1973a, §9.4!

Cf. also *Mvy* 5317: *sāmudrika-nāva* : Tib. *rgya-mtsho* ‘i *gru-bo-che*!

Ms K reading *lugbhiyāye* had originally to be *pra-*°, which has dropped by scribal mistake after the

drawstring casing space. Conze has misread or perhaps corrected it as *praluptiyāye* (Conze 1960, p. 46). However, the question is the strange reading *lugbhiyāye*! In my edition, after having wondered in various ways, I had finally to adopt the reading with a suffix in °iyā-, i.e. *praluptiyāye*. It is to be noted that the manuscripts in Recension B are also confused as reading *pralugbhikāye*, *pralūg*°. Obermiller has corrected *pralugbhikāye* to °*luptikāye* (Obermiller 1937, p. 52, fn. 3; so followed by Vaidya): cf. Edgerton 1961, §29.

The confused form °*lugbh*° must have certainly resulted from the similar graphical shapes of handwritings in this manuscript: — भिद् : भिन्न / लुप् : लुप्त : लुप्ति / लुग् : लुग्न.

Rec. B *praluptiyāye*, loc.sg.f., is simply a locative ending in -āye of *pra-lup-t-iyā-* (°ika- / °ikā- : °iya- / °iyā-) as *asamskrtāye* Rgs II.3a, *anumodanāye* XXVI.1d, and *dakṣiṇāye* XVI.1a: — cf. Yuyama 1973, RgsGr. §9.18! Further for the suffix in °iyā-, fem., see Yuyama 1973, RgsGr., p. 133f.: §30.14. — Cf. also Edgerton 1961, p. 7 : §29; - Edgerton BHSGr 22.23, 'ka-svārthe', also *ibid.*, 22.38 'specifying ka'! — For -iya-, -īya : -ika see also Edgerton BHSGr 22.20!

Incidentally, suffix -k(a) is one of the interested subject: see e.g. Edgerton 1911 & 1957.

Haribhadra's commentary reading *sāmudrikāyām yathā nāvi pralugnāyām* doubtlessly supports my emendation. Here Haribhadra has naturally Sanskritized the passage.

This rare word *pra-lug-* : *pra-lug-na-*, ppp., is cited by Wogihara in his dictionary: *WSJD* p. 869a, *pralugna* [= °-*rugna*], as attested in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya*: 朽壤 / 損失. Cf. also Skt. *ruj-*, *rujati* / *luj-*, *lujyate*.

After all there seems to be no problem to adopt the reading *pralugna-*, but the difficulty is the grammatical question of the locative form *pralugnayāye*. This must be an example of reduplicated locative endings found rarely, i.e. *pralugna-* : Skt. *palugnāyām* / BHS **pralugnāye* ⇒ *pralugnayāye*; cf. Edgerton BHSGr. 9.70 as one of the special forms of oblique cases: *senā-* : *senayāye*, *MvAv* ed. Senart I.158.13 in prose (so read 5 Mss, but one reading *senāyā*), whereas Senart has emended them to *senāye*. Thus, Edgerton reads this portion as *caturamginīyā senayāye*!

Incidentally, this form *senayāye* may have bothered scribes in the course of transmission. In the very old palm-leaf manuscript the reading seems rather confused, though interestingly: Ms. Sa 45a6: *caturamginīyāye* <se>nayā<ye>!, while Sb, fol. 43b6: *caturamginīyā se(.7)nayāye*, as expected by Edgerton! — cf. for these old Mss Yuyama 2001a, p. 23, & 2001b, p. 22.

2b: Vetter suggests in comparing it with the Tibetan that *manuṣya* here could be a nominative denoting a subject of the sentence: i.e. “a man grasping a dead, ...”. I would rather take it as an accusative with *mṛtakam*, i.e. *mṛtakam manuṣya*, acc.sg.m.; cf. *AsP* 143.7 & 10: *mṛta-sarīram*, so Tib. *śi-ba'i ro*.

grhṇamāno, 9th class verb as seen sporadically in Epic and Upaniṣadic Sanskrit; cf. 2d *grhṇate*, 3 sg., which is used 3 pl. Ātmanepada in Skt. — : cf. Yuyama 1983, §32.35, further §39.10 for present participles with thematized verb stems!

2c: °-*madhya*, locative used postpositionally (cf. Yuyama 1983, §8.47); cf. Rgs XXVII.8d *daka-madhyā matsyu* ... (≈ - - - ...)!

2d: For *grhṇate*, 3 sg., see above 2b *grhṇamāno*!

vrajati may well have transmitted to the Tibetans in the graphically similar *udadhi*-° (in handwriting), “the opposite shore of the ocean (*udadhi*)”, — व्रजति : उदधि-; cf. Tib. *rgya-mtsho 'i pha-roll*!

Vetter suggests again in comparison with the Tibetan version (see the text below) to take 1d as: *yo grhṇate vrajati pāra sthalaṃ prayāti*, and to understand as: “the one who grasps sets forth to the goal (*pāra*, acc.sg.) [and] goes to the (opposite dry) shore/land”.

— Now, furthermore, Haribhadra has also understood in the same manner as Vetter. Thus, my first reading *pāra-sthalaṃ* (= Obermiller 1937, p. 52.17) as a compound should be separated as *pāra sthalaṃ*: i.e. *pāra*, should then be taken as a bare-stem accusative, which is rather rare: see Yuyama 1973a, p. 71: §8.24 (cf. Edgerton, BHSGr. §8.31-35)! Acc.sg. ending in -a may well have been -u, as often seen in our text: cf. Yuyama 1983a, p. 71f.: §8.26 (cf. Edgerton, BHSGr. §8.30 with more references)! — Nevertheless, to the contrary to the latter interpretations, we may not totally remove a possibility to remain *pāra-sthala-* as a compound (so reads Obermiller), meaning ‘the opposite land’; *sthala-*, meaning more or less a (dry) land, cf. German *Stelle*: cf. Mayrhofer 1952-1980, III (1962-1976), p. 525, *sthāla-*, nt., s.v.!

Conze 1975 (1962), p. 34 — ‘The Simile of the Ship’:

“When a ship breaks up in the ocean,

“Those who do not get hold of a corpse, a stick or a log,

“Go to their destruction in the midst of the water, without having gained the shore;

“But those who hold on to something, travel to the other shore and reach it.”.

It is noteworthy that Dr. Edward Conze, versed in the Prajñāpāramitā literature and thought, has also made a great contribution to the understanding of the *Rgs*. He has drawn the attention of the specialists to the importance of the so-called Calcutta manuscript (= K; cf. e.g. Yuyama 1976, p. xxiii-xxix). Conze has nevertheless shown his strong interest in the Sanskrit Recension A (cf. e.g. Conze 1978a).

His translation of the *Rgs*, as herewith cited, is based on the Sanskrit Recension B. On referring to his translation one must perhaps remember that it seems too often depend on the Tibetan version (i.e. Recension B).

A provisional trial translation:

“Just as in case of an ocean-going ship were wrecked,

“(One) without grasping a dead man, grasses (or) wood,

“Goes to destruction in the midst of water without reaching (the other) shore.

“(But the one) who grasps (and) sets forth to the other (shore) arrives at the land. (2)

Tibetan Recension A:

dper-na rgya-mtshor 'jug-pa'i gru-ni chag gyur-la /

mi gañ ro 'am rtsva'am śiñ-ni mi 'dzin-pa /

chu-dbus 'jig-par 'gyur-te ñogs-su phyin mi 'gyur /

gañ-žig 'dzin-par rgya-mtsho'i pha-rol phyin-par 'gyur // 2 //

Note – 2c: Emend Tib. B v.l. 'jigs-par (= Skt. *bhī-*) to A (= most B) 'jig-par (= Skt. *vilayaṃ* ...).

It may well be safe to say that both Tibetan Recensions A & B offer no variant readings as far as *Rgs* XIV.2 & 7 are concerned. I have therefore omitted very minor variants (cf. further Yuyama 1976 172, and further for the textual introduction to Tibetan versions see Yuyama 1976, p. xxx-xxxviii).

Chinese Version translated by T'ien-hsi-tsai (天息災): - T.229: VIII.680a9-10.

The Chinese translation was made by Fa-hsien 法賢 (alias 天息災) in 991CE. Fa-hsien had long been wrongly identified with Fa-t'ien (法天). Fa-hsien (Indic Devaśānti?) came from Kashmir to China, where he passed away in 1001 CE. He was renamed Fa-hsien (Dharmabhadra?) in 987 CE. He must certainly have translated the *Rgs* into Chinese in the tenth month of the second year of the Ch'ung-hua (淳化) Era, i.e. 991 CE. This date is attested in the *Ta-chung Hsiang-fu fa-pao-lu* (大中祥符法寶錄: 1011-1015 CE), which was compiled by Yang I (楊億: 974-1020 CE) and others. 參看 · 呂澂編, 新編漢文大藏經目錄 (1980), p. 26: Text No. 0270 (991 CE): — On Yang I see also my “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (II)”, *ARIRIAB*, VII: 2003 (2004), p. 277f.: §8. “宋代の楊億”, an introductory short essay to a useful chronological record of Yang I: 李一飛, 楊億年譜 (Shanghai 2002 / ISBN 7-5325-3225-9). — For further details on the Chinese version see Yuyama 1976, p. xxxix-xliii.

Ju jên yü tu yü ta-hai

如人欲渡於大海

fu i tsao-mu ming fu ch'üan

不依草木命不全

so-chêng ch'uan-fang hu p'o-huai

所乘船舫忽破壞

jo tê i fu ta pi-an

若得依附達彼岸 // 2 //

“As if someone wanting to cross over the great ocean.

“The vessel he embarks on board will immediately breaks down.

“Without grasping plants or wood he will not escape his bare life,

“Nor will he reach the opposite shore.” (2)

Rgs XIV 7***A diplomatic reading of Rgs XIV 7 in the MS K:***

(K13b4) ॥ □□□□□□नावायथाअपरिकर्मकृतासमुद्रेविलयं

(K13b5) प्रयातिसधनासुहवाणिजेभिः । साचैव□□□□□□नापि परिकर्मकृता सुयुक्ता ॥ न च भिद्यते धनसमंगि उ□□□□□□पैति तीरं ॥

Note: समंगि is in fact *samaṅgi* as read in the manuscript — but I am simply unable to type *ṅg* in the Devanāgarī script with my computer!

Rgs XIV.7 reconstructed:*nāvā yathā aparikarma-kṛtā samudre**vilayaṃ prayāti sadhanā saha vāṇijebhiḥ /**sā caiva nāva parikarma-kṛtā su-yuktā**na ca bhidyate dhana-samaṅgi upaiti tīraṃ // 7 //***Text-critical notes on Rgs XIV.7:**

N.B. *Rgs XIV.7* in the Recension B, as edited by Obermiller 1937, based solely on the Chinese blockprint text is to be found in Lokesh Chandra 1980, folio 45a3-b3.

a) *nāvā*-, fem., thematized fem. *nau-* : *nāvā*, nom.sg.f.; cf. *nāva*, nom.sg.f., XIV 7c, below!

parikarma-, nt., “preparation” – “Painting, personal decoration (of body), adoration, worship”.

Cf. AsP 144.7-9 ... *duṣprañña-jāṭīyaḥ puruṣaḥ sāmudrikāṃ nāvam ... aparikarma-kṛtāṃ ... udake 'vatārya ... paripūrṇāṃ bhārātām abhirūḍhaḥ syāt*, ... ; cf. *Rgs XIV 2a note*!

b) *sa-dhanā*, Bhvr., nom.sg.fem., with *nāvā* in pāda a.

Cf. *Rgs XIV 4cd*: *puṇya-jñāna-dhana-sambhṛta-yāna-pātrāḥ ... sugata-bodhi sprśanti* ..., “they, possessed of (voyaging) vessels loaded with riches of merits and knowledge attain the enlightenment of the Sugata”.

vāṇijebhiḥ, instr.pl.m. (Yuyama 1983, §8.81): *-ebhiḥ*, instr.pl.m./nt., only at the end of the lines (Yuyama, 1983, §8.80-82)! — cf. also other instr.pl.m./nt. ending in *-ehi*, *-ehī*, *-ebhi* in our *Rgs* text.

Note *vāṇi-ja-* from *vāṇi-jan-*, “value-°, price-bearer (°-yielder, °-producer)”.

c) Ms K *nāpi* (for *nāvi*?) may not be a true reading. It is difficult to explain how *nau-*, fem., becomes a stem in *-i* (i.e. **nāvi-*) and then used for nom.sg.fem. ending in *-i* (i.e. *nāvi*!). All the other manuscripts including the Turfan blockprint text read *nāva* (of *nāvā*-, fem.), which may well be the true reading (cf. Yuyama 1973, p. 81: §9.4). — Conze 1960, p. 46, may have misread Ms K as *nāyi*, which must be improbable. It is frequently difficult to distinguish *pa* and *ya* in any manuscripts, though.

d) *bhid-ya-te*, pass. (Skt.) of *bhid-*, VII, “to break (down), be destroyed, be broken, come into pieces”.

Rec. A: *dhana-samaṅgi*, nom.sg.f. (Yuyama 1973, §11.4): Conze misread K as °-*samagri*<ṃ>, also unmetr.!

Rec. B: °-*samagram*, nom.sg.nt., “the whole” (= Obermiller 1937, p. 54)! — see also below!

= (d) “Is not broken up, and the entire wealth comes to the shore”!?

Conze, “Then it does not break up, and all the goods get to the [other] shore” (p. 35)!

°-*samaṅgi*, Bahuvrīhi-compound, with *nāva*, *nāvā*, nom.sg.fem. — It is to be noted that this interesting reading is otherwise found only in the Turfan blockprint text. — cf. also Edgerton *BHSD*, p. 560b, *samagra-*, *samaṅin-*, ss.vv. Further see Edgerton *BHSGr*, §10.30 for *-ī*, as a rare feminine stem for Skt. *-inī* with an example *dhyānasukha-samaṅgī* from the *Lalitavistara* 56.20 (verse), with a few other examples, where Edgerton notes there is no stem *-samaṅga* in normal use)!

Turfan Fragment

A hitherto unknown version in blockprint kept in the Turfan Museum

Rgs XIV 7 starts from folio 6, line 2

For details see the coloured plate appended at the end of this volume.

On my visit to the Turfan Museum (the then Turfan Exhibition Hall) in September 1979 the folio was

exhibited 90 degrees inclined to the right in a glass case with a caption:

“八思巴文仏經印本・元代(公元1280-1368)・柏孫克里克千仏洞”

‘A printed copy of Buddhist sutra in Phgapa during the Yüan dynasty (1280-1368 CE)
– unearthed in a Thousand-Buddha Cave at Bāzāklik’

The description of the fragment should be corrected at least as follows:

“A Chinese Blockprint Fragment of the Indic version of the

Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā

Printed in the so-called Rañjana in Indic or Lañ-tsha script in Tibetan”

(See further my “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), §II.43, 97, 99-101)

Turfan fragment reading Rgs XIV.7:

Thanks to the clearer photo of the Turfan fragment, *aiti* can explicitly be read after the damaged part <> on line 3. This may well be noteworthy that the fragment text is closer to Recension B (all MSS read *upaiti*; naturally so Obermiller 1937, p. 54), whereas Rec. A singly reads *prayāti* (= Ms K). — Small *akṣaras* reading *Lu-Tha-Ta* are numerals “100-20-5”, i.e. 125 = Serial Verse No. 125! Cf. Yuyama 2008 & 2010 for further details.

Page 11b, line 2:> nāvā yathā aparikarmakṛtā samudre vila=

Line 3:>aiti sadha<nā> saha vāñijebhiḥ sā caiva nāva parikarmakṛta

Line 4:>na ca bhidyate dhanasamaṅgi upaiti tīraṃ *Lu-Tha-Ta*

Turfan fragment reading reconstructed:

nāvā yathā aparikarma-kṛtā samudre

vila<yam up>aiti sadha[nā] saha vāñijebhiḥ /

sā caiva nāva parikarma-kṛt<ā> [suyuktā]

na ca bhidyate dhana-samaṅgi upaiti tīraṃ // 7 //

Note: <> a damaged in the blockprint.

[] a damaged portion added with a supposed reading

Conze 1975 (1962), p. 34f. — ‘The Simile of Two Ships’:

“A ship, which is not well got ready, in the ocean

“Goes to destruction, together with its goods and traders.

But when a ship is well got ready, and well joined together,

“Then it does not break up, and all the goods get to the [other] shore.”

A provisional trial translation:

“Just as in case a ship, not built after careful preparation, in the ocean

“Possessed of riches together with the traders, goes to destruction;

“But the ship, built after careful preparation (and) well-fixed (*or* well-yoked),

“Possessed of all kinds of riches, does not break but comes to the shore.” (7)

Tibetan Recension A:

dper-na bcos legs ma byas gru-ni rgya-mtsho'i nañ /

nor dan bcas-siñ tshoñ-par bcas-te 'jig-par 'gyur /

gru de legs-par bcos legs byas dan ldan gyur-na /

mi 'jig nor dan bcas-par ñogs-su phyin-par 'gyur // 7 //

Chinese Version translated by T'ien-his-tsai (天息災): T.228: p. 680a19-20.

wei yu shang-jên yü ju hai

fu tsao hsien-ku ta ch'uan-fang

未有商人欲入海

不造堅固大船舫

i hsien-ku ch'uan wu pu-wei

huo to chên-pao taopi-an

依堅固船無怖畏

獲多珍寶到彼岸 // 7 //

“There will be no trader (who) wants to sail out (← enter) into the ocean,

Without building a solid large vessel;

“Because of the solidness there will be no fear (to him),

Obtaining a lot of rare treasures, (he) will reach the shore”. (7)

Appendix

A Chinese Blockprint from Peking

To my great regret, I have been unable to obtain a photocopy of the original blockprint text printed most probably at the Temple Sung-chu-ssü (嵩祝寺) in Peking. It is indeed a great pity, therefore, that I cannot show the facsimile of the relevant portion on the plate. Those who are interested in it are requested to refer to Lokesh Chandra 1980, p. 2122-2123!

The original printing is held in the famed collections in the following places:

1. St. Petersburg (formerly Leningrad): a copy brought back by M. Tubiansky from the Monastery of Mañjuśrī (MandzuSriin kiit), Mongolia — This is the very exemplar, on which is based Obermiller's edition: O / Obermiller 1937.
2. Berlin: Staatsbibliothek Berlin: Inventory No. Tib.Bl. 1.
3. Canberra: Australian National University Library: Repertory No. (OS) BL1410.P7T5.*
4. Kyoto: Otani University Library: Catalogue No. 13012.
5. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London: Inventory No. 82 825.
6. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture: see Lokesh Chandra 1980.
7. Sendai: Tōhoku University Library: Tohoku Catalogue No. 6774.

*The exemplar held in the A.N.U. Library (Canberra) had once belonged to Hsü Ti-shan (許地山, Pen name 落花生: 1893-1941): 109 folios (size: 40.5 x 10.8 cm), 308 verses.

Cf. Yuyama 1976, p. xxvii-xxviii, and for further details see Yuyama 1967, p. 19-32, 110f., 118f.

The Sanskrit text is printed in the *Raṅjana* (or *Laṅtsha*) script on the first line followed by its transliteration in the Tibetan *dBu-can* script on the second line, and the Tibetan translation on every third line in the *dBu-can* script. After all each page of the folio consists of six lines: *Rgs* XIV 2 on fol. 身43b4/5/6 – 44a1/2/3. Cf. O / Obermiller 1937, p. 52. — *Rgs* XIV 7 on fol. 身44b4/5/6 – 45a4/5/6 (= O / Obermiller 1937, p. 54).

In the space on the left-hand side of the front page (*recto*) of a folio are written the title in the abbreviated form and the page number: i.e. *Sdud-pa* (= Skt. *saṃcāya*) and *že-bži*, i.e. 44. On the right-hand side are found the text number probably in the so-called 'A Thousand-Character-Poem' in Chinese: 身 (No. 147) and the numeral 四十四 'forty-four'. On the back page (reverse) is found only Chinese numeral on the right-hand space, i.e. 四十三, '43'. Incidentally, 身 may indicate the number '147' of the "Thousand-Character Poem (千字文)". I have however no idea what it means, say, for example, if it is a text number of a certain collection?

Concluding word:

In this paper I had to limit myself more or less on the Indic texts from textcritical points of view. Much deeper textcritical analyses must be done. A number of important works for deeper understanding are thus omitted. However, basic problems have been discussed in Yuyama 1976. Otherwise, for a very brief and compact introduction to various recensions and their studies see Yuyama 1978.

Haribhadra's Commentary on the *Rgs*

A Prefatory Note¹

§0.0. Every scholar interested in the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature and its thought must certainly feel obliged to see if Haribhadra has mentioned the text concerned, and/or further how he has commented - understood any reading of the original.² Needless to say, it will be more exciting and vitally important to learn how he has understood any original Indic passage if at all possible. The Tibetan version can be used to some extent — but it does not help guessing the original Indic. Although it had long been known that the original Indic text of Haribhadra's commentary existed in manuscript form. During the first expedition to Tibet from 1929 to the following year, Rāhula Sāṃkrtyāyana discovered a Sanskrit manuscript in the Monastery at Īva-lu Ri-phug (舍魯普) near Śi-ga-rtse: Volume XI, Text No. 4 (Serial No. 42): 20²/₃ x 2¹/₃ inches (= ca. 52.49 x 5.92 cm) in size.³

§0.1. When the late Professor Chiang Chung-hsin 蔣忠新 has published the article mentioned above, I was naturally in the first place pleased to see it, although the very palm-leaf manuscript had been preserved in the Library of the Peking Cultural Palace of Nationalities — only one folio (北京民族文化宮圖書館, now called the China Ethnic Library: 中國民族圖書館) (cf. Wang 1985, No. 18 = Hu-von Hinüber 2006, p. 300), i.e. the last one: Haribhadra's commentary on *Rgs* XXXI 8 to XXXII 6 and the colophon: 47.2 x 4.4 cm., with 11 lines on the obverse side and 10 on the reverse (Chiang 2000, p. 116). Nevertheless, I have learned a great deal of the character of Haribhadra's manner of comments. At the same time, I was rather disappointed to find that he does not cite the whole text of verses but *only* the very beginning word of each verse (cf. Yuyama 2001, p. 42). Even with such a small portion I could see small but important variant readings of the text — in comparison with Recensions A & B. It was particularly important to see Professor Chiang has bought out the folio in facsimile form.

§0.2. Needless to say, every one must have been looking for the appearance of the whole manuscript. Some several years ago I was gladly surprised to see an Indian scholar bring out the very commentary in Indic in the Devanāgarī script (cf. Lal 2009-2011). It was needless to say very welcome that I could at last consult Haribhadra's commentary as a whole. At the same time again, it was very disappointing to learn that they seemed to have no plan to reproduce the manuscript in facsimile form. I am naturally still waiting for the appearance of the photomechanical reproduction — indeed still in vain. I cannot wait for it any longer. It is much better than nothing. At least it is clear that the two manuscripts, one at Sarnath (in film) and the other in Peking, are different to each other, when compared the very final portion

¹ Cf. the following text of the *Rgs* cited from my edition of the Recension A, i.e. Yuyama 1976, unless otherwise stated.

² As is well known, there are some different theories about the dates of Haribhadra, say, from the eighth to the tenth centuries. Although this dating question is not the main subject here, I am not certain if this question has been solved: cf. Yuyama 1976, p. xviii: §22; and further Ruegg 1973, p. 124.

³ Cf. Sāṃkrtyāyana 1935, p. 31. — Cf. also Yuyama 1976, p. l; and for further details Chiang 2000, esp. p. 115f., and Yuyama 2001, esp. p. 27-30.

available in the two manuscripts at hand. According to Chiang, the fragment he has consulted is the one Sāṃkṛtyāyana reported as extant in the Monastery Žva-lu Ri-phug near Śi-ga-rtse. If, however, Lāl has a almost complete manuscript of the manuscript that Sāṃkṛtyāyana described. It remains indeed mysterious, until there appears the manuscript in facsimile form — with more concrete facts.

§0.3. In the present paper I am therefore to consult Haribhadra's commentary in the meantime from Lāl's edition (cf. Lal 2009-2011). Thus, for *Rgs* XIV, I simply rely upon Lāl's text: *i.e.* Lal 2010a. — Incidentally, it is a pity that Lāl-jī has repeated the same mistake I had once committed as to the discovery place of the very manuscript by Mahāpaṇḍita Rāhula Sāṃkṛtyāyana. Indeed to my great shame, I had mistakenly cited Rāhul-jī's description of the place of discovery as Spos-khañ Monastery near Gyañ-tse.⁴ I recall that I had consulted Rāhul-jī's report hastily. Alas, this mistake has been repeated by Lāl-jī!⁵

§0.4. With a sigh of great regret to confess frankly, time has run out before I try to go into text-critical details on the original texts and Haribhadra's commentary both in Indic and Tibetan. But I must satisfy myself that I could after all meet the original Indic text. So that I was able to cite its Tibetan translation transmitted in the four Tripiṭakas, *i.e.* Cone, Derge, Narthang and Peking editions, for future study on this topic.

Haribhadra's commentary ad *Rgs* XIV.2:

— ed. Lal 2010a, p. 156, line 9-11:

From the edition Lal I guess that this portion must be folio 66a-66b in the original manuscript.

*sāmudrīty ādi / sāmudrikāyāṃ yathā nāvi pralugnāyāṃ mṛtakam manuṣyam tṛṇam
kāṣṭham vālabhanam kaś-cid a-grhṇan vināśam prayāti jala-madhye a-prāpta-tīraḥ / yas tu
punar mṛtakādikam grhṇāti sa sukhena vrajati pāram ata eva sthalam prayāti /*

“The *sea* (*sāmudrī-*) and so forth:- Just as in case a seagoing (*sāmudrikā-*) ship were wrecked (*pralugna-*), one without grasping (*grah-*) hold (*ālambana-*) of a corpse (*mṛtaka-*), (a piece of) grass (*tṛṇa-*) or woodstick (*kāṣṭha-*) goes to ruin in the midst of the water (*jala-*) without reaching (*prāp-*) the shore (*tīra-*). However, on the contrary, he who grasps a corpse et cetera sets forth easily (*sukhena*) to the opposite (*pāra-*) (and) hence reaches the (dry) ground (*sthalā-*).”

Haribhadra's Comm. in Tib. trsl. ad *Rgs* XIV.2 (*C44b3, D41b4, N46a1, P50b4*):

*dper-na žes-bya-ba-la-sogs-pa gsuñs-te / dper-na rgya-mtshor 'jug-pa'i gru-ni chag gyur-pa
/ mi gañ ro'am rtsva'am śiñ-ni mi 'dzin-pa / (C.b4, N.a2) chu dbus 'jig-par (D.b5) 'gyur-te
ñogs-(P.b5)su phyin mi 'gyur / yañ gañ-žig ro-la-sogs-pa-la 'dzin-pa de-ni bde-bar pha-rol-tu
phyin-par 'gyur-te //*

⁴ Cf. e.g. Yuyama 2001, p. 29 with a detailed note!

⁵ Cf. Lal 2009a, p. 119f.

Haribhadra's commentary on Rgs XIV.7:**— ed. Lal 2010a, p. 157, line 2-5:***From the edition Lal I guess that this portion must be folio 67b in the original manuscript.*

nāvety ādi / naur yathā pūti-kāṣṭhādi-apanayanād aparikarma-kṛtā mahā-samudre vilayaṃ prayāti sa-dhanā saha vaṇigbhih / sā caiva nauḥ parikarma-kṛtānukūla-vātatvāt su-yuktā na bhidyate dhana-samaṅginī cōpaiti tīram /

“The **ship** (*nāvā-*) and so forth:- Just as in case a ship (*nau-*), carrying wealth (*sa-dhana-*), built with careless preparation (*aparikarma-kṛta-*) after removing (*apanayana-*) the putrid timber (*pūti-kāṣṭha-*) and so forth* goes to destruction (*vilayaṃ prayāti*) in the great ocean (*mahā-samudra-*) together with the traders (*vaṇij-*). But (if) the ship (*nau-*) were built with careful preparation (*parikarma-kṛta-*) (and) firmly yoked (*su-yukta-*) is not wrecked (*bhid-*) for the fair (tail-)wind (*anukūla-vātatvāt*) and reaches (*upa-i-*) the shore (*tīra-*) altogether with the wealth (*dhana-samaṅginī-*).”

* = leaving the putrid (i.e. rotten) timber and so on untouched.

Haribhadra's Comm. in Tib. trsl. ad Rgs XIV.7 (C.45a7, D.42a7, N.46b4, P.1b2):

lan (D.b1) 'di dper-(C.b1, N.b5)) na źes-bya-ba-la sogs-pa gsuñs-te / dper-na rñiñ-par byuñ-pa-la sogs-pa'i bcos legs ma byas-pa'i gru rgya-mtsho chen-(P.b3)por nor dañ bcas-par 'jig-par 'gyur-ro / / yañ gru legs-par bcos legs-par byas-pa dañ / mthun-pa'i rluñ dañ ldan-par byas-na (D.b2. N.b5) 'jig nor dañ bcas-pa ñogs-su phyin-par 'gur-ro / /

Bibliography with Abbreviations

N.B. My works are referred to with my name with the number of years.

For further details about the summaries of contents
see A. Yuyama, “A List of Writings with Brief Bibliographical Notes”,
ARIRIAB, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 343-390.

You are cordially requested to browse in the following “Bibliography with abbreviations”.

A = Sanskrit Recension A (of the *Rgs*).

AsP = *Aṣṭasāhasikā Prajñāpāramitā*: reference is made to the edition by P. L. Vaidya, *Aṣṭasāhasikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary called Āloka* (= *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, IV) (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit, 1960).

B = Sanskrit Recension B (of the *Rgs*), ed. by O(bermiller).

Chiang 2000 = Zhongxin Jiang (Chiang Chung-hsin: 蔣忠新), “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā-vyākhyā* of Haribhadra: A Romanized Text”, *ARIRIAB*, III: 1999 (2000), p. 115-123 (with a folded plate preceding the article); — cf. Yuyama 2001!

Conze 1960 = Edward Conze, “The Calcutta Manuscript of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*”, *IJJ*, IV, 1 (1960), p. 37-58.

Conze 1975 (1962) = *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary*, translated by E. Conze (= *Wheel Series*, I) (Bollinas: Four Seasons Foundation, 1973, reprinted with 3 pages of corrections, 1975), xxii, 323 p. — ISBN 0-87704048-6.

Cf. —, “Verses on the Accumulation of Precious Qualities (*Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*)”, *Indo-Asian Studies*, I (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, XXXI) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1962), p. 126-178.

Conze 1978 = Edward Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd rev. & enlarged ed. (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Maior*, I) (Tokyo: The Reiyukai / [IIBS], 1978).

Cf. Yuyama 2013, p. 363: Item II.27.

Conze 1978a = Edward Conze, “Review of Yuyama 1976”, *JRAS* 1978, p. 89.

Edgerton *BHSD* = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (= *William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

Edgerton *BHSG* = — —, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (= *William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

Edgerton 1911 = — —, *The k-suffixes of Indo-Iranian* (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1911) [Doctoral dissertation at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore]: = The *k*-suffixes in the Veda and Avesta.

Edgerton 1957 = — —, “The Specifying Suffix *Ka*”, *Felicitation Volume Presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvalkar*, or *Dr. S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume*, ed. S. Radhakrishnan, V. V. Mirashi, etc. (Banaras: Motilal Banarsidass, 1957), p. 81-83.

Edgerton 1961 = F. Edgerton, “*The Prajñā-Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā*”, *IJJ*, V, 1 (1961), p. 1-18.

Heissig 1954 = Walther Heissig, *Die Pekingener Lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache. Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte* (= *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen*, II) (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954).

Hiraoka 2010 = 平岡聡訳・ブツダの大いなる物語／梵文『マハーヴァストウ』全訳・上下二巻 (東京・大蔵出版, 2010).

Hu-von Hinüber 2006 = Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Mūlśarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣa found in Tibet”, *Jaina Itihāsa Ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, hrsg. Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz & Anne Peters (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XLVII) (Marburg 2006), p. 283-337. — cf. *infra* Wang 1985!

IJJ = *Indo-Iranian Journal* (’s-Gravenhage, et alibi, 1957-).

Jones 1949-1952-1956 = *The Mahāvastu*. Translated from the Buddhist Sanskrit by J. J. Jones. 3 vols. (= *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, XVI-XVIII-XIX) (London: The Pali Text Society / Luzac & Co., 1949-1952-1956) [Reprinted by the Pali Text Society, London, and distributed by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London-Boston,

1973/1987-1976-1983].

K = Manuscript K / A manuscript kept in the Asiatic Society of Calcutta (Kolkata): No. 10736, dated 1174 CE.
Cf. for further details *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 353 fn.*

Karashima 1988 = 辛島昇, “十三世紀における南インドと中國の間の交流 — 泉州タミル語刻文と元史馬八児傳をめぐって —”, 榎博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢 (東京・汲古書院, 1988), p. 77-104.

Karashima 2001 = 辛島昇, “中世タミル商人ギルドの活動を記すヴィハーラヒナナ刻文”, 石上善應教授古稀記念論文集・仏教文化の基調と展開, I (東京・山喜房仏書林, 2001), p. 107-113.

Karashima 2003 = 辛島昇, “中世インド洋における商人ギルド「五百人組」の活動について”, 東方學 *Eastern Studies*, No. 105 (Jan. 2003), p. 1-17, with an English summary on p. 3-4 (*from back*). — with special reference to South Indian epigraphical documents.

Karashima 2004 = *In Search of Chinese Ceramic-sherds in South India and Sri Lanka*, edited and written by Noboru Karashima with contributions by many others (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2004).

Lal 2009-2010-2011 = Banārasī Lāl, “*Ācārya-Haribhadra-viracitā Ratna-guṇa-sañcaya-gāthā-vyākhyā*”, *Dhṛṭh: Journal of Rare Buddhist Texts Research Unit*, Vol. XLVII (Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2009), p. 117-144 (Chap. I-II); — XLVIII (2009), p. 157-171 (Chap. III-IX); — XLIX (2010), p. 147-168 (Chap. X-XIV); — L (2010), p. 131-158 (Chap. XV-XXV); — LI (2011), p. 193-214 (Chap. XXVI-XXXII).

Lal 2009a = *Dhṛṭh*, XLVII (2009), p. 119f.

Lal 2010a = *Dhṛṭh*, XLIX (2010), p. 156f. (seemingly in the original Ms. fol. 66a-68b).

Nota Bene: Haribhadra's *Vyākhyā* on *Rgs* Chap. XIV “*Aupamyā*”, verses 2 & 7, are to be found in the *Dhṛṭh*, XLIX (2010), p. 156.9-11 and p. 157.2-5 respectively.

Lienhard 1985 = Siegfried Lienhard, *Die Abenteuer des Kaufmanns Siṃhala. Eine nepalische Bilderrolle aus der Sammlung des Museums für Indische Kunst, Berlin* (= *Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin*, VII) (Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst – Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1985), 255 p. (incl. 11 figs., XXIX pl. for 80 scenes, 6 photos, 1 map).

Lokesh Chandra 1980 = *Multi-Lingual Buddhist Texts in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian and Manchu*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Prof. Raghuvira, VI (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, CCLII) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1980), p. 2121-2123 (*Rgs* Chapter XIV).

This text was most probably printed at the Temple Sung-chu-ssū (嵩祝寺) in Peking. — cf. Heissig 1954, also Yuyama 1967, p. 19-32, 110f., 118f.

N.B. This represents the Recension B, as edited by Obermiller 1937.

Mayrhofer 1952-1956-1980 = Manfred Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (= *Indogermanische Bibliothek*, II. Reihe: *Wörterbücher*) (Heidelberg 1952-1956-1980).

MvAv = *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*.

Mvy = *Mahāvvyutpatti*, ed. Ryōzaburō Sakaki: 榊亮三郎, 翻訳名義大集 (= 京都帝國大學文科大學叢書, III) (Kyoto 1916).

Tibetan Index made by Kyōo Nishio: 西尾京雄, 藏梵對照・翻訳名義大集・西藏語索引 (= 佛典研究, I) (Kyoto 1936).

Reprinted in 2 volumes (= *Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series*, I) (Tokyo 1962).

Cf. Mvy, ed. Unrai Wogihara: 荻原雲來, 梵漢對譯・佛教辭典 / *The Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary of Buddhist Technical Terms based on the Mahāvvyutpatti* (Tokyo 1915; 2nd ed. reprinted 1959).

O = O / Obermiller 1937 = *Rgs*, ed. E. E. Obermiller, *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (= *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XXIX) (Moscow-Leningrad 1937).

N.B. This edition is based solely on the Chinese blockprint bilingual text. — cf. Lokesh Chandra 1980.

Photomechanic reprint with a Sanskrit-Tibetan-English-Index by Edward Conze (= *Indo-Iranian Reprints*, V) (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1960).

Photomechanischer Nachdruck als *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XXIX (Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1970).

Photomechanic reprint within the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* (= Vol. XXIX) (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977).

This last one is rather clearly reproduced.

PTSD = *Pali Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary*, ed. T. W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede (published in 4 parts) (London: PTS, 1921-1925).

Rgs = *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*. — see Yuyama 1976.

Ruegg 1973 = D. Seyfort Ruegg, *Le traité du tathāgatagarbha de Bu-ston* (= *Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, LXXXVIII) (Paris: EFEO, 1973).

Sa = Ms Sa (of the MvAV), a palm-leaf manuscript kept in microform in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (cf. Yuyama 2001a).

Sāmkṛtyāyana 1935 = Rāhula Sāmkṛtyāyana, “Sanskrit Palm-leaf MSS. in Tibet”, *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa research Society*, XXI, 1 (Patna 1935), p. 21-43, plates on 2 pages [= Expedition 1919-1930].

Senart 1882-1890-1897 = Émile Senart, *Le Mahāvastu. Texte sanscrit publié pour la première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire*. 3 tomes (= *Collection d'ouvrages orientaux, Société Asiatique*, Seconde série) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1882-1890-1897) [Reprint - Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977].

Seṭh = Haragovindās Trikamachand Seṭh, *Pāia-sadda-mahapṇavo* (= *Prakrit Text Society Series*, VII) (Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society, 1963) [first published 1928].

V / Vaidya = Rgs. ed. P. L. Vaidya in the *Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha*, I (= *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, XVII) (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Research and Learning in Sanskrit, 1961), Text No. 22: p. 352-397. — Recension B, based on Baroda Ms.

Wackernagel-Debrunner III = Albert Debrunner & Jacob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, III: *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1920).

Wang 1985 = 王森, 中國民族圖書館藏・梵文貝葉經目錄 (一九八五年四月) [Mimeographed].

Wag Sen's catalogue has been reprinted as an appendix I in: Hu-von Hinüber 2006, p. 297-344.

Wogihara 1915 = 梵漢對譯・佛教辭典 (東京・丙午出版社, 1915, 2nd ed. 1926; 第二版再刷・山喜房佛書林, 1959).

WSJD = 荻原雲來, 梵漢對照・梵和大辭典 (辻直四郎協力) : *Wogihara's Sanskrit-Japanese Dictionary* (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation / Kōdansha, 1979).

Yuyama 1967 = A. Yuyama, *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library* (= *Centre of Oriental Studies, Occasional Paper Series*, VI) (Canberra: ANU, 1967).

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 352: Item No. I.1a.1.

Yuyama 1972 = A. Yuyama, “Some Glossarial Notes on the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Proceedings and Papers of the Fourteenth Congress of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association held 19-26 January 1972 at the University of Otago, Dunedin, NZ*, ed. K. I. D. Maslen (Dunedin 1972), p. 30-37.

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 360f.: Item No. II.13.

Yuyama 1973a = A. Yuyama, *A Grammar of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Sanskrit Recension A)* (= *Oriental Monograph Series*, XIV) (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies in association with Australian National University Press, 1973), xxxii, 190 p. — ISBN 0-7081-0843-1.

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 352: Item No. Ia3.

Yuyama 1973b = A. Yuyama, “Remarks on the Metre of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Commemorative Volume on the 70th Birthday of Acharya Raghu Vira*, Part II, ed. Perala Ratnam (= *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture*, II) (= *Śatapīṭaka Series*, XCVI) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1973), p. 243-253.

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 361: Item No. II.18.

Yuyama 1976 = *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*, edited with an Introduction, Bibliographical Notes and a Tibetan Version from Tunhuang by A. Yuyama (Cambridge / London-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976), lxxii, 214 p., 1 frontisp. (Photomechanic reproduction of the Calcutta Ms. Folio 2b & 3a). — ISBN 0-521-21081-X (1976 ed.); ISBN 0-978-0-521-14320-2 (2010 digital paperback reprint edition).

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 352f.: Item No. Ia.4 & 4a.

Yuyama 1978 = 湯山明, “*Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *The Introduction to the Bibliotheca Buddhica* / 仏教文庫・文献解題 (Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyūkai, 1978), p. 74-76.

Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 363: Item No. Ia.4 & 4a.

- Yuyama 1983 = A. Yuyama, *Kacchapa-Jātaka: Eine Erzählung von der Schildkröte und dem Kranzwinder* (= *Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series*, V) (Tokyo: IIBS, 1983).
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 354: Item No. II.29c.
- Yuyama 1986 = 湯山明, “梵文宝徳藏般若木版本断簡”, 平川彰博士古稀記念・仏教思想の諸問題 (東京・春秋社, 1986), p. 443-453.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 366: Item No. II.43.
- Yuyama 1992 = A. Yuyama, “*Pañcāśatī*, ‘500’ or ‘50’ — with special reference to the Lotus Sutra —”, *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, hrsg. Heinz Bechert (= *SBF*, IV, 2) (= *AAWG*, III, 194) (1992), p. 208-233.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 368: Item No. II.56 (with my autocommentary).
- Yuyama 2001 = A. Yuyama, “*Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* of Haribhadra: Preliminary remarks”, *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000 (2001), p. 27-42. — cf. Chiang 2000!
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 372: Item No. II.77.
- Yuyama 2001a = *The MvAv in Old Palm-leaf and Paper Manuscripts*, I-II (= *Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum*, XV-XVI) (Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO at The Toyo Bunko, 2001).
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 355f.: Item No. II.11a & 11b.
- Yuyama 2004a = 湯山明, “楞伽島備忘襍記”, 三笠宮殿下米寿記念論集 (東京・刀水書房, 2004), p. 743-760.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 374: Item No. II.90.
- Yuyama 2004b = 湯山明, “マハーヴァストウ・アヴァダーナに表題のみ見せる長爪経の周辺”, 神子上恵生教授頌寿記念論集・インド哲学仏教思想論集 (京都・永田文昌堂, 2004), p. 15-26.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 374: Item No. II.92.
- Yuyama 2005 = 湯山明, “楞伽島備忘襍記の雜學的拾遺”, *ARIRIAB*, VIII: 2004 (2005), p. 3-20.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 374: Item No. II.90.
- Yuyama 2007a = A. Yuyama, “On and Around a Hitherto Unknown Indic Version of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* from Turfan”, *ARIRIAB*, X: 2006 (2007), p. 3-38.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 375: Item No. II.97.
- Yuyama 2007b = A. Yuyama, “A Hitherto Unknown Indic Version of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *The Pandita and the Siddha: Tibetan Studies in Honour of E. Gene Smith*, ed. Ramon N. Prats (Dharamsala: Amnye Machen Institute / Tibetan Centre for Advanced Studies, 2009), p. 304-313.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 376: Item No. II.99.
- Yuyama 2008 = 湯山明, “吐魯番博物館藏梵文宝徳藏般若木版断片 論攷追補”, *ARIRIAB*, XI: 2007 (2008), p. 335-341.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 376: Item No. II.100 & 100a.
- Yuyama 2010 = A. Yuyama, “Further Remarks on the Blockprint Text of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* from Turfan”, *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Eli Franco and Monika Zin (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2010), p. 259-268.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 376: Item No. II.101.
- Yuyama 2011 = A. Yuyama, “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Anecdotal Gleanings (III): ロバート・ノックスのスリランカ — 楞伽島備忘襍記の雜學的餘滴 —”, *ARIRIAB*, XIV: 2010 (2011), p. 249-258.
Cf. “List of Writings”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 377: Item No. II.105.
- Yuyama 2013 = —, “A List of Writings with Brief Bibliographical Notes — Appendix: Curriculum Vitae — A Succinct Autobiographical Record —”, *ARIRIAB*, XVI: 2012 (2013), p. 343-390.

*

Postscriptum:- I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Yeh Shao-yung (葉少勇) for his untiring advice and help particularly with regard to the Turfan blockprint fragment.

Last but not the least, I beg your pardon for my unidiomatic English text — indeed, English à la japonaise! You are cordially requested to understand what I intend to describe.